



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/496,983

02/02/2000

Mitsunobu Ono

P/16-253

6940

7590

12/16/2003

Steven I. Weisburd
Ostrolenk, Faber, Gerb & Soffen
1180 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10036-8403

EXAMINER

AN, SHAWN S

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2613

DATE MAILED: 12/16/2003

13

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/496,983

Applicant(s)

ONO ET AL.

Examiner

Shawn S An

Art Unit

2613

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 September 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 2613

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. As per Applicant's instructions in Paper 12 as filed on 9/15/03, claims 1-2 and 12 have been amended.

Claim Objections

2. Amended claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities: claim 1, line 12, "which which" is redundant. Appropriate correction is required.

Response to Remarks/Argument

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-13 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Newly claimed subject matter is broad enough to use the previous prior arts, but taking different interpretation of the previous prior arts to reject the amended limitations.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-3 and 5-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakamura et al (5,627,583) in view of Yabe et al (4,845,555).

Art Unit: 2613

Regarding claims 1 and 5, Nakamura et al discloses an endoscope apparatus, comprising:

- a first drive signal generator (CCD driver) for generating a drive signal for driving an imaging device (Fig. 1(a), 11) removably connected to an endoscope (Fig. 8, 82);

- a video signal extracting portion (CDS circuit) for obtaining a first video signal included in an imaging signal obtained in the imaging device (Fig. 8, 84);

- a second drive signal generator (SSG) for generating a second drive signal for controlling a timing when the video extracting portion obtains the first video signal (Fig. 8, 77);

- a first processor (video processor) that includes as part of the first processor and at least part of a circuit for obtaining a second video signal that can be displayed on a monitor (Fig. 8, 71 FPGA(1)); and

- a delay circuit (91) for delaying at least part of signals among signals after video processing.

Nakamura's delay circuit is not partially interposed between the signal source and the first drive signal generator, for delaying at least part of signals included in the first drive signals and the second drive signals.

However, Yabe et al teaches an electronic endoscope comprising delay circuit (Fig. 10, 34), which is included as part of the first processor (2, 7), which is partially interposed between a signal source (13) and the first drive signal generator, (16) for delaying at least part of signals included in the first drive signals (16) and the second drive signals (14).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the relevant art employing an endoscope apparatus as taught by Nakamura et al to incorporate the delay circuit which is partially interposed between a signal source and the first drive signal generator, for delaying at least part of signals included in the first drive signals and the second drive signals as taught by Yabe et al so that the delay circuit is part of the first processor of Nakamura's, for delaying at least part of signals among signals included in the first drive signals and the second

Art Unit: 2613

drive signals in order to correct signal line delay and ultimately reducing many additional components associated with time delaying compensation.

Regarding claim 2, the Examiner takes official notice that DSP is an electronic component that is well known in the art.

Regarding claim 3, the Examiner takes official notice that a delay circuit varying in its delay time, such as in a remote/manual/set controlled delay, is well known in the art.

Regarding claims 6 and 7, the Examiner takes official notice that setting a timer or an user manually specifying delay time on a conventional switches is well known in the art. Therefore, it is considered an obvious variation to specify delay time or to set information which the delay time can be derived, so that the second processor are able to set the delay time depending on the condition of the switch for correction of the line delay.

Regarding claims 8 and 12, Yabe et al teaches delay time being derived from information indicating length of an insert portion of the endoscope (col. 8, lines 51-55).

Regarding claims 9 and 13, Nakamura discloses a control CPU (Fig. 6, 56) for identifying the type of endoscopes. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Nakamura's teaching with Yabe et al's delay circuit so that the delay time can be derived including identification information as an effective way to measure precise delay time in order to correct line delay signal.

Regarding claims 10 and 11, an information acknowledgment portion, such as a typical (auto) confirmation signal, are considered an obvious feature, so that the second processor sets the delay time depending on information acknowledged from the information acknowledgment portion.

Art Unit: 2613

6. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakamura et al and Yabe et al as applied to claim 3 above, and further in view of Pasqualini (6,397,374 B1).

Regarding claim 4, the combination of Nakamura et al and Yabe et al fails to disclose the delay circuit comprising a multistage buffer circuit connected in series, and a circuit for selecting the number of stages of the buffer circuit.

However, Pasqualini teaches conventionally well known delay circuit comprising a multistage buffer circuit connected in series (Fig. 6), and a circuit for selecting the number of stages of the buffer circuit (col. 8, lines 52-67) in order to vary the delay timing.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the relevant art employing an endoscope apparatus as taught by Nakamura et al to incorporate the teaching of the delay circuit comprising a multistage buffer circuit connected in series, and the circuit for selecting the number of stages of the buffer circuit as taught by Pasqualini et al as an effective way to vary the delay time in order to correct line delay signal with accuracy.

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2613

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shawn An whose telephone number (703) 305-0099 and schedule are Tuesday-Friday.



SHAWN S. AN
PATENT EXAMINER

SSA

December 11, 2003